



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
WWW.USPTO.GOV

PERMAN & GREEN
425 POST ROAD
FAIRFIELD CT 06824

MAILED

MAR 14 2011

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of	:	
Pekka Lonka	:	
Application No. 10/692,273	:	DECISION ON RENEWED PETITION
Filed: October 23, 2003	:	PURSUANT TO
Attorney Docket Number: 297-	:	37 C.F.R. § 1.183
008681-US (REI)	:	
Title: MOBILE COMMUNICATIONS	:	
DEVICE WITH A CAMERA	:	

This is a decision on the renewed petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.183,¹ filed July 26, 2010, requesting the waiver of 37 C.F.R. § 1.63(a)(1).²

The renewed petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.183 is **DISMISSED**.

The present application No. 10/692,273 is for the reissue of U.S. Patent number 6,308,084, which issued on October 23, 2001, from application number 09/325,025.

Both a notice of appeal and a "Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review" were submitted on December 11, 2006. The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to reply in a timely manner to the "Notice of Panel Decision from Pre-Appeal Brief Review," mailed January 23, 2007, which set a one-month period for response. No response was received, and no extension of time under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) was requested. Accordingly, the above-identified application became abandoned on February 24, 2007. A notice of abandonment was mailed on January 7, 2008.

¹ See MPEP § 603: "[w]hen an inventor who executed the original declaration is refusing or cannot be found to execute a required supplemental declaration, the requirement for that inventor to sign the supplemental declaration may be suspended or waived in accordance with 37 CFR 1.183."

² The non-final Office action indicated that the reissue declaration that was present on filing was defective.

Decision on renewed petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.183

RELEVANT REGULATIONS AND PORTION OF THE MPEP

37 C.F.R. § 1.63(a)(1) sets forth, *in toto*:

(a) An oath or declaration filed under § 1.51(b)(2) as a part of a nonprovisional application must:

(1) Be executed, i.e., signed, in accordance with either § 1.66 or § 1.68. There is no minimum age for a person to be qualified to sign, but the person must be competent to sign, i.e., understand the document that the person is signing;

37 C.F.R. § 1.183 sets forth, *in toto*:

In an extraordinary situation, when justice requires, any requirement of the regulations in this part which is not a requirement of the statutes may be suspended or waived by the Director or the Director's designee, sua sponte, or on petition of the interested party, subject to such other requirements as may be imposed. Any petition under this section must be accompanied by the petition fee set forth in § 1.17(f).

37 C.F.R. § 1.175(a) sets forth, *in toto*:

(a) The reissue oath or declaration in addition to complying with the requirements of § 1.63, must also state that:

(1) The applicant believes the original patent to be wholly or partly inoperative or invalid by reason of a defective specification or drawing, or by reason of the patentee claiming more or less than the patentee had the right to claim in the patent, stating at least one error being relied upon as the basis for reissue; and

(2) All errors being corrected in the reissue application up to the time of filing of the oath or declaration under this paragraph arose without any deceptive intention on the part of the applicant.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY AND ANALYSIS

A petition, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.181, to withdraw the holding of abandonment was filed on January 15, 2008, and was dismissed via the mailing of a decision on July 14, 2008.

An original petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) was filed on July 31, 2008, along with an amendment, the petition fee, and the proper statement of unintentional delay. The original petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) was dismissed via the mailing of a decision on March 10, 2009.

A petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.183 and a renewed petition pursuant to 1.137(b) were concurrently filed on September 9, 2009. The former was dismissed and the latter was granted via the mailing of a single decision on May 26, 2010, which indicated, *in pertinent part*:

This petition cannot be granted, as Petitioner has not asserted, much less established, the existence of an extraordinary

Decision on renewed petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.183

situation such that justice requires the waiver of the requirement that the supplemental reissue declaration be executed by the sole inventor.

On renewed petition, Petitioner will need to assert the existence of an extraordinary situation, such that justice requires the waiver of the requirement that the sole inventor must execute the supplemental reissue declaration.

Assuming arguendo that Petitioner has asserted the existence of an extraordinary situation such that justice requires the waiver of the requirement that the supplemental reissue declaration be executed by the sole inventor, this petition cannot be granted as the record does not support a finding that this assertion has been established. A discussion follows.

While Rule 1.47(b) is not directly applicable to the current set of facts, it does provide a similar method for rectifying situations involving the refusal of an inventor to execute a declaration. As such, a Rule 1.47(b) analysis will be applied to determine whether an extraordinary situation is present, such that justice requires the waiver of Rule 1.63(a)(1). The applicable elements are as follows:

- (1) a statement of the last known address of the sole inventor;
- (2) proof that either:
 - (a) a copy of the application was sent or given to the sole inventor for review and proof that he/she has refused to sign, or;
 - (b) proof that diligent efforts have been made to locate the sole inventor;
- (3) proof that the Rule 47(b) (sic) applicant has sufficient proprietary interest in the subject matter to justify the filing of the application;
- (4) proof of irreparable damage, and;
- (5) an acceptable oath or declaration in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §§ 115 and 116 and 37 C.F.R. § 1.63.

With this petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.183, Petitioner has included a portion of the petition fee,³ the last known address of the non-signing sole inventor,⁴ proof that a complete copy of the application was sent to the last known address of the non-signing sole inventor,⁵ and proof that he has refused to execute the supplemental reissue declaration.⁶

Requirements (1) - (3) above have been satisfied.

3 \$200 was submitted. The additional \$200 was charged to Deposit Account No. 16-1350 on May 25, 2010.

4 Statement of facts submitted with the original petition, section II.

5 *Id.* at III (5-10)

6 *Id.* at III (8 and 10).

Decision on renewed petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.183

Regarding the fourth requirement, no proof of irreparable damage has been submitted.⁷ A statement by Rule 47(b) (sic) applicant that the filing is necessary to preserve the rights of the parties would be sufficient.

Regarding the fifth requirement, a supplemental reissue declaration has not been located in the electronic file. On renewed petition, Petitioner must include a supplemental reissue declaration that has been executed in accordance with MPEP §§ 324 and 409.03(b).

May 26, 2010 decision on original petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.183, pages 3-5.

With this renewed petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.183, Petitioner has again failed to either assert or establish, the existence of an extraordinary situation such that justice requires the waiver of the requirement that the supplemental reissue declaration be executed by the sole inventor.

On second renewed petition, Petitioner will need to assert the existence of an extraordinary situation, such that justice requires the waiver of the requirement that the sole inventor must execute the supplemental reissue declaration.

Assuming arguendo that Petitioner has asserted the existence of an extraordinary situation such that justice requires the waiver of the requirement that the supplemental reissue declaration be executed by the sole inventor, this petition cannot be granted as the record does not support a finding that this assertion has been established. A discussion follows.

With this renewed petition pursuant to Rule 1.183, Petitioner has included both a statement by the Rule 1.47(b) Applicant that the filing is necessary to preserve the rights of the parties and a supplemental reissue declaration. It follows that the fourth requirement that was set forth on the fourth page of the decision of May 26, 2010 has been satisfied. To date, requirements (1) - (4) have been satisfied. The fifth requirement has not been satisfied, as will now be pointed out.

Petitioner has not established the right of the purported Assignee to take action, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 3.73. See also

⁷ See MPEP § 409.03(g).

Decision on renewed petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.183

MPEP § 324. On second renewed petition, Petitioner must include both a statement under 37 C.F.R. § 3.73(b) and the written consent to the reissue by the assignee(s) and any inventor having an ownership interest.

CONCLUSION

The time period for filing a renewed petition is governed by 37 C.F.R. § 1.181(f). Therefore, if reconsideration of this decision is desired, any response to this decision must be submitted within **TWO MONTHS** from the mail date of this decision, and **extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are not permitted**. The reply should include a cover letter entitled "Second Renewed Petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.183." This is not a final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C § 704.

Any such second renewed petition should indicate in a prominent manner that the attorney handling this matter is Senior Attorney Paul Shanoski, and may be submitted by mail,⁸ hand-delivery,⁹ or facsimile transmission (FAX).¹⁰ Registered users of EFS-Web may alternatively submit a response to this decision via EFS-Web.¹¹

Telephone inquiries regarding *this decision* should be directed to Senior Attorney Paul Shanoski at (571) 272-3225.¹² All other inquiries concerning examination procedures or status of the application should be directed to the Technology Center.

/Kenneth M. Schor/

Kenneth M. Schor
Senior Legal Advisor
Office of Patent Legal Administration

⁸ Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, United States Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA, 22313-1450.

⁹ Customer Window, Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA, 22314.

¹⁰ (571) 273-8300: please note that this is a central facsimile number.

¹¹ <https://sportal.uspto.gov/authenticate/authenticateuserlocalepf.html>

¹² Petitioner will note that all practice before the Office should be in writing, and the action of the Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.2. As such, Petitioner is reminded that no telephone discussion may be controlling or considered authority for Petitioner's further action(s).